

REMARKS

No claims are amended. Claims 1-26 are currently are pending. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present case are respectfully requested.

In the present Office Action, claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as all of the pending claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112. Specifically, the present Office Action, at page 2, asserts that “there is no indication in the Applicant’s specification about the identified stored document being mutated,” and at page 14, notes that the argument that the applied references do not disclose “... a mutation system that applies one or more mutators to the portion of the original document **which were applied to mutate the portion of the identified stored document,**” has not been considered since this is asserted as new matter not supported by the specification. However, contrary to such assertions, Applicant’s specification (emphasis added) clearly supports the noted feature, for example, as set forth below (see also, e.g., FIGs. 3-7 and the discussion in Applicant’s specification thereof):

[0023] In step 106, **the document processing system 12 obtains the one or more mutators used in the identified, stored document** from memory storage device 20 for possible use in the selected portion of the original document. A variety of different types of mutators could be obtained, such as mutators for adjusting a font of type, adjusting line spacing, adjusting at least one color, and adjusting a location of at least one section in the portion of the original document. For example, the mutator for increasing font size to increase legibility is illustrated in FIG. 3 and the mutator for making the line lengths shorter to increase legibility is shown in FIG. 4, although again other types of mutators alone or in different combinations could be obtained and used.

[0025] In step 110, the document processing system 12 determines which of the one or more mutators obtained from the identified, stored document to use on the selected portion of the original document. The document processing system 12 determines which of the mutators to use based on the characteristics of the device on which the original document is going to be displayed and based on one or more elements of the original document, although other manners for determining which of the mutators to select can be used. For example, if the printer 14 selected for the printing job is a black-and-white printer, then **a mutator for altering color obtained from the identified, stored document** is irrelevant and would not be used by the document processing system 12. In another example, the document processing system 12 could have lists of mutators stored in memory 20 which are associated with particular types of documents, such as for text documents, documents with text and images, and documents with images, and then the document processing system 12 would determine to use the obtained mutators that were on appropriate stored list for the type of

document that matches the portion of the original document or the original document.

[0030] In step 116, **the document processing system 12 stores the selected portion of the original document with the applied mutators as one of the stored documents in memory storage device 20. The newly stored portion of the original document can now be used to assist with determining the layout of other portions of the original document or of other documents to be displayed.**

Accordingly, all of the present claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and no further rejection on such basis is anticipated. If, however, the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to engage in a joint effort to derive mutually satisfactory solution.

Based on the above discussion, the rejection of (i) claims 1-3, 5, 9-12, 14, 16, 18-21, 23, and 25 based on Hind et al. (USP 6,463,440) and Zlotnick (USP 6,778,703), (ii) claims 4, 13, and 22 based on Hind et al., Zlotnick, and Brown et al. (USP 6,880,014), and (iii) claims 6-8, 15, 17, 24, and 26 based on Hind et al., Zlotnick, and Wanderksi et al. (USP 6,519,617) are respectfully traversed. Specifically, as noted above, the novel features of “a mutation system that applies one or more mutators to the portion of the original document which were applied to mutate the portion of the identified stored document,” as recited in independent claim 1, and “applying one or more mutators to the portion of the original document which were applied to mutate the portion of the identified stored document,” as recited in independent claims 9 and 18, clearly are supported by Applicant’s specification and the applied references do not disclose, teach or suggest such features.

By contrast, Hind et al. is directed to retrieving style sheets from a data repository based upon matching one or more stored characteristics of a style sheet against a pattern (column 8, lines 15-19). According to Hind et al., an attribute storing characteristics of a style sheet and an attribute storing the identification of a style sheet are stored in an LDAP object (column 9, lines 31-43). When a pattern is matched against the characteristics stored in the LDAP objects, a style sheet from the repository is identified for that pattern. However, even if one were to consider, for the sake of argument, that the Hind et al. objects could reasonably be construed to be a “stored document,” as claimed, there is no mention or suggestion whatsoever in Hind et al. of any mutation applied to these stored objects, much less an application of that mutation to a portion of an original document. Thus, it is

respectfully submitted that Hind et al. does not describe, teach or suggest “a mutation system that applies one or more mutators to the portion of the original document which were applied to mutate the portion of the identified stored document,” as recited in claim 1, nor “applying one or more mutators ... which were applied to mutate the portion of the identified stored document” set forth in claims 9 and 18.

Zlotnick, Brown et al., and Wanderksi et al. fail to cure the noted deficiencies in Hind et al. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 9 and 18 are allowable over Hind et al., Zlotnick, Brown et al., and Wanderksi et al., taken alone or in combination. The dependent claims are allowable over the applied references, taken alone or in combination, on their on merits and for at least the reasons as argued above with respect to independent claims 1, 9 and 18.

The references that have been cited, but not applied in the present Office Action, have been taken in consideration in formulating the present response. However, as the present Office Action has not deemed these references of sufficient relevance to apply in a formal rejection against any of the pending claims, no detailed comments thereon are believed necessary at this time.

In view of all of the foregoing, applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly sought.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/Carlos R. Villamar, Reg. # 43,224/

Carlos R. Villamar

Reg. No. 43,224

NIXON PEABODY LLP

CUSTOMER NO.: 22204

401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900

Washington, DC 20004

Tel: 202-585-8000

Fax: 202-585-8080